

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/621,206	07/15/2003	James T. Kealey	300622008800	1089
7590 03/17/2006			EXAMINER	
TED APPLE (TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND)			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
379 LYTTON AVENUE PALO ALTO, CA 94301		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1656	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/621,206	KEALEY ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
•	Hope A. Robinson	1656			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	<u> </u>				
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim viil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 1, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 Ja	anuary 2006.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	·				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or extraction. 	oloction requirement				
o) Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or t	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine		÷			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
,	difficient to the diddined office	770001 01 1011111 1 0 102.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	s have been received				
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior					
application from the International Bureau	•	-			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal F	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)				

Application/Control Number: 10/621,206 Page 2

Art Unit: 1656

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-19, drawn to a recombinant host cell, classified in class 435, subclass325.
 - II. Claim 20 drawn to a method for producing an analog of 6-deoxyerythronolide Br, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- 2. Invention I comprises several starter units (claim 6), which will require a specific host cell. In addition the claimed invention comprise several different polyketides (claim 14). If Invention I is elected applicant is required to also elect a starter unit and polyketide (presented in claims 6 and 14 respectively), for examination on the merits. If applicant elects Invention II, an election of a starter unit is also required. This is a species election.
- 3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Groups I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide can be make synthetically, thus a materially different process.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,206 Page 3

Art Unit: 1656

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Furthermore, the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as a separate subject for inventive effect and require independent searches. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. A reference, which would anticipate the invention of one group, would not necessarily anticipate or make obvious the other group. Moreover, as to the question of burden of search, classification of subject matter is merely one indication of the burdensome nature of the search involved. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, election of a single group for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection is governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance is governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for

Application/Control Number: 10/621,206

Art Unit: 1656

patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between products claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Application/Control Number: 10/621,206 Page 5

Art Unit: 1656

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr can be reached on 571-272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope A. Robinson, MS

Examiner Art Unit 1656

HOPE ROBINSON PATENT EXAMINER

March 8, 2006